

## APPENDIX J

### RECORD REVIEW SURVEY DATA

#### SUMMARY

Nearly half of reviewers (47%) reported that the access-level record would be sufficient to meet their needs. *Place of Publication* was the only record element which was cited as an omission from the access-level record that would have an adverse affect on user and was not **also** cited as an unnecessary or confusing element in the control record. It is estimated that addition of *Place of publication* to the access-level record would bring access-level record acceptance up to somewhere between 71 and 83%.

#### DATA COLLECTION

- 88 reviewers at 14 libraries reported on their review of project records by filling out an online survey. Reviews were reported from April 6 to April 17, 2006 and were imported to a spreadsheet for analysis. See Appendix K.

#### SURVEY QUESTIONS & SUMMARY RESULTS

##### 1. Please indicate your professional position:

Of 88 reviewers:

- 36 (41%) identified as *Reference Librarian\**
- 1 (1%) identified as *Reference Paraprofessional\*\**
- 10 (11%) identified as *Acquisition Librarian\*\*\**
- 11 (13%) identified as *Acquisition Paraprofessional*
- 10 (11%) identified as *Systems Librarian/Other Professional*
- 2 (2%) identified as *Systems Paraprofessional*
- 18 (20%) identified as *Other*

Of those 18 reviewers identified as *Other*:

- 4 (5%) identified as some form of *Serials Paraprofessional*
- 3 (3%) identified as *Cataloging Librarian* or *Cataloger*
- 2 (2%) identified with multiple roles (ie, *Reference/serials checkin staff supervisor/bibliographer*)
- 9 (10%) identified as some other position type (ie, *Government Documents Librarian*)

\*1 reviewer self-identified as *Other* but described as "Reference Librarian & OPAC Committee Chair"

\*\*1 reviewer self-identified as *Other* but described as "Reference Technician"

\*\*\*1 reviewer self-identified as *Other* but described as "Electronic Publications Acquisitions Librarian"

##### 2. Please indicate the institution you represent.

Of 88 reviewers:

8 (9%) Columbia University  
3 (3%) Government Printing Office  
3 (3%) Harvard University  
5 (6%) Library & Archives Canada  
5 (6%) Library of Congress  
6 (6%) National Agricultural Library  
6 (7%) National Library of Medicine  
6 (7%) Oklahoma State University  
8 (9%) Stanford University  
14 (16%) University of California at Los Angeles  
9 (10%) University of Chicago  
5 (6%) University of Georgia  
10 (11%) University of Washington

3. Did you view the records as printouts or in your local system?

Of 88 reviewers:

30 (35%) viewed records only as printouts  
14 (16%) viewed records only in their local system  
43 (49%) viewed records both in printouts and in their local system  
1 (1%) did not answer this question

4. Did you view the records in MARC displays or labeled displays?

Of 88 reviewers:

9 (10%) viewed only MARC displays  
30 (34%) viewed only labeled displays  
47 (53%) viewed as both MARC and labeled displays  
2 (2%) did not answer this question

5. Did you view the records as full displays or brief displays?

Of 88 reviewers:

34 (39%) viewed only as full displays  
0 (0%) viewed only as brief displays  
52 (59%) viewed as both brief and full displays  
2 (2%) did not answer this question

6. If you viewed brief records, was there any negative impact on brief records caused by the access level records?

Of 88 reviewers:

30 (34%) reported no negative impact  
25 (28%) did not view brief records  
23 (26%) did report negative impact  
10 (11%) did not answer this question

Of the 23 reviewers who cited a negative impact, the most commonly cited missing elements were place of publication (cited by 10 reviewers) and date of publication (cited by 4 reviewers). 7 reviewers either made general comments (eg, “*The records are incomplete.*”) or noted that fact that brief displays have nothing to do with testing the access-level record (eg, “*I don’t believe ‘brief displays’ is a factor in evaluating access level records since different systems define different data elements for their custom displays. I never use brief records—always immediately go to full or MARC displays.*”). All comments are available in the survey results spreadsheet.

7. Did you notice anything about access-level records (omissions, inclusions, ways of expressing information, etc.) that would have an adverse impact on a user’s ability to find, identify, select, or obtain the item?

<b>Question 7: Omissions or changes resulting in adverse effects on user's ability to find, identify, select, or obtain an item.</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No adverse impact	21	23.9%
Place of publication only	32	36.4%
Not relevant or no change from current standards*	10	11.4%
Place of publication + other issues	5	5.7%
Uniform titles	5	5.7%
No answer	4	4.5%
Physical description	3	3.4%
Other	3	3.4%
Lack of justification for added entries	2	2.3%
Publication Date	2	2.3%
<i>Subtotal of adverse impact answers</i>	66	75.0%
Skipped question	1	1.1%
<b>Total</b>	88	100%

8. Which record do you believe would be easier for the average user of your library to understand?

Of 88 reviewers:

- 15 (17%) cited the control record
- 29 (33%) cited the access record
- 41 (47%) stated both were about the same
- 3 (3%) did not answer this question

9. Do you have any comments to add regarding which records you believe would be easier for your library's average users to understand?

Of the 60 comments that were provided by reviewers:

- 30 commented positively on the ease of understanding, lack of *confusing* information (including *librarian’s jargon*) and removal of redundancy and unnecessary information (eg, physical description)

- 12 expressed concern about the ability for the access-level record to identify generic or duplicate titles (most commented on place of publication)
- 8 expressed concerns about elements which were not part of the access-level practice, but instead were differences between two catalogers (eg, subject headings)

10. Were there any elements missing in the access level record and present in the control record, which would have an adverse impact on a users's ability to find, identify, select or obtain the item?

Of 88 reviewers:

- 21 (24%) responded there were no elements missing in the access-level record
- 64 (73%) responded there were elements missing in the access-level record
- 3 (3%) did not answer this question

The 64 comments submitted were similar in distribution to those cited in question #7:

- Place of publication (35)
- Not relevant or no change from current standards (25)
- Uniform titles (6)
- Physical description (5)
- Subtitle (4)
- Publication Date (4)
- Statement of responsibility (3)
- Frequency (2)
- Lack of justification for added entries (2)
- Also issued as notes* (2)
- Numbering irregularity notes (2)
- System requirements notes (1)

11. Were there any elements in the control record that you feel are unnecessary or confusing to a user's ability to find, identify, select or obtain the item?

Of 88 reviewers:

- 40 (45%) responded there were no unnecessary/confusing control record elements
- 46 (52%) responded there were unnecessary/confusing control record elements
- 2 (2%) did not answer this question

44 comments cited these control record elements as unnecessary or confusing:

- Physical description (9)
- Notes in general (5)
  - Cataloging information notes (e.g., issue described) (7)
  - Mode of access notes (7)
  - Latest issue consulted notes (2)
  - Also issued in notes* (1)

Imprint notes (1)  
Quoted notes (1)  
Uniform titles that duplicate information already in the record (7)  
Statements of responsibility that duplicate information already in the record (5)  
Title variants/Abbreviated titles (5)  
Identification numbers such as LCCN (3)  
Subtitles (2)  
Date of publication (1)

In addition there were five comments speaking to the general complexity and unorganized nature of control-record displays

Several comments were clear about the fact that some of the information was important for “access” or useful to staff but was unnecessary and confusing in the public display.

12. Which elements in the bibliographic record are the most important to you in the work that you do? Please list these elements:

The 86 free-text responses that were received varied widely from as brief as:

- 260 (in some cases, 130)
- 022, 245

to as detailed as:

- 05X-08X 1XX 20X-24X 50X-58X (as above, sometimes crucial, sometimes "why"?) 6XX 856

to explanatory streams of consciousness:

- *When the user's citations are incomplete, we rely on the cataloging record to help us track down the correct publication. The records in the access and control group all have fairly unique titles. But when the titles are common words and there are numerous publications with the same title, we need such elements as place of publication. Most of the time, what I need as a reference librarian is the title and a clear holdings statement - what do we have, what is the format, and where is it located. It is only when the user has an incomplete citation that we need more elements. Because users turn to us when they have problems with matching their information to our holdings, we tend to think we ALWAYS need more information, but that is not the case. I suspect the problems we see are small in comparison to the number of users who find what they need on their own, and who would appreciate not being confronted with data they usually don't need.*

The complete text of all responses is available in the survey results spreadsheet.

13. Would an access level record be sufficient to meet your needs for the work you do?

Question 13: Would an access level record be sufficient to meet your needs for the work you do?		
Category	Number	Percentage
Record meets needs	41	46.6%
Place of publication only	12	13.6%
Okay much of the time	5	3.4%
Issues not related to access level standard	2	2.3%
Various issues including place of publication	5	5.7%
Lack of detail for ongoing maintenance	4	4.5%
Lack of detail for identification of items	4	4.5%
General lack of detail	4	4.5%
One or more issues other than place	3	3.4%
Uniform titles	3	3.4%
Objections based on specific types of serials	3	3.4%
Objections based on needs of different users	1	1.1%
Subtotal of problems cited	46	52.3%
Skipped question	1	1.1%
Total	88	100.0%

Of 88 reviewers:

41 (47%) replied *Yes*

46 (52%) replied *No*

1 (1%) reviewed did not answer this question

Of the 46 *No* responses, many referred back to their answers to questions #7, #10 & #12 stating that if those fields were included (primarily place of publication) that they would feel the access-level record would be sufficient.

The complete text of all responses is available in the survey results spreadsheet

.

14. Any other comments:

45 additional comments were submitted. Most generally followed the same themes as previously reported. The complete text of all responses is available in the survey results spreadsheet.